



Artificial Intelligence Tools for Enhancing Academic and Psychological Student Support Services in Public Universities in Rivers State, Nigeria

By

Mohammed, N. M¹., Wey-Amaewhule, B. (PhD)²

¹Department of Educational Management Faculty of Education

²Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State,



Article History

Received: 05/08/2026

Accepted: 14/08/2026

Published: 17/08/2026

Vol – 5 Issue –8

PP: - 63-70

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.
22002841

Abstract

The study examined artificial intelligence tools for enhancing academic and psychological student support services in public universities in Rivers State. Three objectives, three research questions and three hypotheses directed the enquiry. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The population comprised 92,836 respondents, made up of 92,570 students and 266 administrative staff drawn from three universities. From this population, 541 respondents consisting of 382 students and 159 administrative staff were drawn using a multi-stage sampling technique. Three experts validated the instrument, which returned a composite Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.81. The research questions were answered with mean and standard deviation, while the hypotheses were tested with the z-test at the 0.05 level of significance. The results showed that each of the three tools examined, namely AI-powered mental health systems, predictive analytics systems and AI-enabled writing assistant tools, enhanced student support services to a high extent. On two of the tools, the perceptions of students and administrative staff did not differ significantly; on AI-enabled writing assistant tools, however, a significant difference emerged. It was recommended, among others, that university management and government should raise their investment in robust digital infrastructure so that AI-powered mental health systems can be deployed and used effectively, thereby strengthening students' emotional well-being, widening access to prompt and confidential psychological support, and making student support more sustainable, accessible and responsive.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Psychological Student Support Services, Mental Health Systems, Predictive Analytics, Writing Assistant Tools

INTRODUCTION

Scholarly interest in the place of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools within higher education has grown considerably, and much of that interest now centres on what such tools can contribute to student support services in public universities. Students of this era are digital natives. They are continuously connected, and many of them find digital platforms easier to approach than face-to-face channels. Supporting such a generation therefore calls for engagement in the medium they already inhabit, which is technology. Where AI-powered tools are built into support systems, institutions become able to deliver prompt, personalised and scalable assistance at any hour and at the point where students actually are (Chaushi et al., 2024). Such tools nevertheless require human oversight if their use is to remain ethical and relevant. Giannini (2024) argued that AI is not meant to displace human interaction but to work alongside it, with human judgement guiding

integration so that service delivery improves, administrative burdens lighten, student outcomes strengthen and the quality of the educational experience rises.

Public universities in developing nations such as Nigeria face mounting pressure to raise the quality of student services at a time of swelling enrolment, tight resources and the demands of digital transformation. Within Rivers State, institutions such as the University of Port Harcourt (Uniport), Rivers State University (RSU) and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE) serve a large, varied and expanding student body. Like their counterparts elsewhere, these universities find it difficult to deliver timely and comprehensive services against a background of rising enrolment, infrastructural limitation and thin human resources. As the needs of students grow more complex, AI-powered tools have begun to emerge as a means of reinforcing existing support structures with services that are prompt, personalised and efficient. The administrative side of the problem has already been recorded within this

same university system. In a correlational study of administrative officers in universities owned by Rivers and Bayelsa States, Wey-Amaewhule et al. (2024) reported that quality assurance compliance, leadership style and digitalisation each related significantly and positively to the actualisation of institutional goals. Service delivery in these universities, on that evidence, is shaped by administrative strategy quite as much as by the level of resources available.

Artificial intelligence describes the simulation by machines of human intelligence in areas such as learning, problem-solving, perception and language understanding, and it carries transformative possibilities for African higher education in learning outcomes, administrative efficiency and research capacity (Eltahir & Babiker, 2024; Mohammed-Shittu, 2025). Its development rests on algorithms and technologies able to carry out work once thought to belong to human cognition alone, including reasoning through problems, arriving at decisions and processing language (Tuomi, 2018). The field covers a broad set of technologies, machine learning, natural language processing and robotics among them, that allow machines to undertake tasks ordinarily demanding human intelligence. As the field advances, its educational applications have drawn steady attention from researchers and practitioners. Evidence from Rivers State suggests, however, that attention has not yet become practice. Working with the entire population of adult educators in Rivers State-owned universities, Taylor et al. (2025) found awareness of artificial intelligence tools to be only moderate, the extent of utilisation to be low, and respondents to be uneasy about the ethical implications of adoption. That distance between awareness and use is a necessary starting point for any assessment of AI-enabled support services in this setting.

Student support services (SSS) are the institutional resources and programmes provided to help students succeed academically, personally, administratively, socially and in career terms within the learning environment (Mohammed & Wey-Amaewhule, 2026). Academic advising, counselling, wellness programmes, administrative guidance, financial aid assistance and disability support fall within this range, and each is intended to strengthen persistence, academic success and the wider learning experience (Shaheen et al., 2020; Elsayad, 2023). Support systems that work well raise retention by helping students overcome obstacles that run from financial hardship to mental health difficulty, while supplying the skills and resources on which academic achievement depends.

According to Almada (2021), the central purpose of bringing AI into student support is to reach large numbers of students proactively, anticipating difficulty and dealing with it before it grows severe enough to damage academic performance. Support mechanisms become more efficient and more effective when AI is embedded in them, because the manner of delivery changes: repetitive administrative work is automated, student needs are predicted and academic guidance is offered in real time, so that no student is lost to the limits of manual, staff-dependent systems. This administrative use of AI has also been studied locally. Nwuke

and Yellowe (2025) examined the utilisation of artificial intelligence in school supervision for effective administration in Rivers State and reported that AI-assisted monitoring made administrative oversight timelier and more consistent, since routine tracking could be automated and human attention reserved for matters calling for professional judgement.

The case for AI tools becomes sharper still when the mental health difficulties of present-day students, most of whom belong to Generation Z, are taken into account. Constant exposure to social media, with its curated images of perfection and success, leaves many students isolated or overwhelmed, and this is compounded by the heavy academic pressures of university life and by weak institutional support. Schools, which ought to be safe places for emotional and academic growth, frequently lack the capacity to respond as they should. Survey evidence has put the proportion of Gen Z who feel stressed or anxious all the time at 40% (Deloitte, as cited in Muhammad & Wayhu, 2024).

AI-powered mental health systems are intelligent applications that deliver emotional and psychological support through chatbots, virtual counselling, mood tracking and self-help interventions, with Wysa, Woebot, Youper, Replika and Tess among the examples. Systematic reviews have pointed to reduced symptoms of anxiety and depression among students who use AI-based chatbots, together with gains in emotional resilience, well-being and social connectedness (Reyes-Portillo et al., 2025). Sun et al. (2025) drew attention to a growing dependence on digital mental health solutions, especially among Generation Z students, who lean towards technology-mediated interaction. Mixed-methods evidence has also shown meaningful student engagement with such a tool, with users describing support that was accessible, confidential and scalable beyond what traditional counselling offered, and with 91.24% of respondents rating Wysa as beneficial for managing emotional well-being and stress; the researchers accordingly recommended that the tool be combined with human-led university services rather than substituted for them (Khan et al., 2025).

Predictive analytics tools apply machine learning to large datasets in order to forecast student behaviours, including dropout risk, signs of stress or depression, performance trends and emerging support needs. Utibe et al. (2025) held that predictive analytics enables administrative staff to recognise “at-risk” students before failure or withdrawal occurs, so that intervention can be proactive. Several universities abroad have adopted predictive analytics systems to flag at-risk students for targeted support, with reported gains in retention and graduation rates. Green et al. (2025) added that improved educational outcomes follow from predictive analytics where it sits within a holistic framework built on equity, accountability and human-centred decision-making. Academic advisers also draw on it when monitoring student progress and distributing support resources.

AI-powered writing assistant tools, among them ChatGPT, Grammarly and QuillBot, help students build academic writing, grammar and communication skills through real-time

feedback and suggestion. Such assistants strengthen academic literacy by acting as “digital tutors”, which is of particular value to students from varied linguistic backgrounds (Fitra et al., 2025). Alkamel and Alwagieh (2024) stressed that educators need structured ways of bringing these assistants into academic practice, including explicit teaching on ethical use, encouragement of critical engagement with AI-generated feedback, and positioning of the tools as collaborative “writing partners”. Writing support of this kind also shapes student engagement and learning strategy. Emerging work on AI literacy indicates that how productively students engage with generative AI affects their independent writing performance, since those who actively rework AI-generated text tend to produce stronger essays; the link is therefore with deep cognitive processing rather than with passive dependency (Zhao et al., 2025). The capacity of staff and students alike to engage productively with these tools is thus itself a development question. Studying 381 teachers across the three senatorial districts of Rivers State, LongJohn and LongJohn (2026) found that continuous professional learning and reflective practice significantly strengthened professional competence, and urged that such programmes be institutionalised rather than left to individual effort. The argument carries directly over to AI literacy, which is unlikely to spread evenly where structured institutional provision is absent.

Statement of the Problem

Nigerian public universities continue to contend with rising student enrolment, too few counselling personnel, delayed academic support, weak early identification of students in academic difficulty and limited personalised learning support. Academic performance, psychological well-being, retention and the overall educational experience all suffer as a result. Artificial intelligence technologies have shown considerable promise in supporting mental health, forecasting academic risk and improving academic writing, yet their application in Nigerian public universities remains comparatively undeveloped. Much of the existing research has concentrated on AI adoption in teaching and learning, and comparatively little of it has addressed the contribution of AI to comprehensive student support services. Few studies, in addition, have examined stakeholders' perceptions of several AI support tools at once within Nigerian higher education. Empirical evidence is therefore still too thin to guide educational administrators and policymakers on adopting AI-powered mental health systems, predictive analytics systems and AI-enabled writing assistant tools as integrated parts of student support services. It was against this background that the study set out to examine the extent to which AI-enabled technologies contribute to improved student support services in public universities.

Purpose of the Study

The study set out to examine artificial intelligence tools for enhancing academic and psychological student support services in public universities in Rivers State. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. assess the extent to which AI-powered mental health systems enhance student support services for students in public universities in Rivers State;
2. investigate the extent to which predictive analytics tools enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State;
3. assess the extent to which AI-powered writing assistants enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent do AI-powered mental health systems enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?
2. To what extent do predictive analytics tools enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?
3. To what extent do AI-powered writing assistants enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which AI-powered mental health systems enhance emotional support services in public universities in Rivers State.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which predictive analytics tools enhance academic support services in public universities in Rivers State.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which AI-powered writing assistants enhance student support services in public universities in Rivers State.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Its population stood at 92,836, comprising 92,570 students and 266 administrative staff in the three public universities in Rivers State. A sample of 541 respondents was drawn, the size being determined from the Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table, and a multi-stage sampling technique was used in selecting them. Data were gathered with a self-structured questionnaire titled “Artificial Intelligence Tools for Enhancing Academic and Psychological Student Support Services in Public Universities Questionnaire”, built on a 4-point modified Likert rating scale of Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE) and Very Low Extent (VLE), weighted 4 to 1 respectively. Three experts validated the instrument, one from Educational Management and two from Measurement and Evaluation at Rivers State University. Reliability was established through Cronbach Alpha statistics, which returned indexes of 0.73, 0.87 and

0.82. Mean and standard deviation answered the research questions, while the null hypotheses were tested with the z-test at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Question 1: To what extent do AI-powered mental health systems enhance emotional support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Difference between Administrative Staff and Students Perceptions of AI-powered Mental Health Systems for Enhancing Student Support Services in Public Universities

S/N	Items	Students n = 382		Admin. Staff n = 159		Remark
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	AI-powered mental health systems provide personalized responses that address students' emotional concerns.	3.03	0.65	2.92	0.73	HE
2	AI-powered mental health systems improve students' access to psychological support services outside regular counselling hours.	2.99	0.74	3.08	0.73	HE
3	AI-powered mental health systems helps students manage stress, anxiety or emotional distress effectively.	3.06	0.69	2.92	0.78	HE
4	The use of AI-powered mental health systems reduces the stigma associated with seeking emotional support, giving student sense of privacy.	3.11	0.76	2.94	0.80	HE
5	AI-powered mental health systems assists in identifying early signs of emotional distress among students.	3.09	0.72	3.00	0.66	HE
6	AI-powered mental health systems complement existing university counselling services effectively.	2.99	0.68	3.09	0.67	HE
7	AI-powered mental health systems significantly improve the effectiveness of emotional support services available to students in the university.	3.02	0.71	2.97	0.62	HE
	Grand Mean	3.04		2.99		HE

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

Table 1 returned grand mean scores of 3.04 for students and 2.99 for administrative staff. Both values sit inside the 2.50–3.49 band set as the criterion for high extent. Students and administrative staff therefore held positive perceptions of

what AI mental health systems can do for students' emotional and psychological well-being.

Research Question 2: To what extent do predictive analytics tools enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Difference between Administrative Staff and Students Perceptions of Predictive Analytics Tools for Enhancing Student Support Services in Public Universities

S/N	Items	Students n = 382		Admin. Staff n = 159		Remark
		M	SD	M	SD	
8	Predictive analytics tools help identify students at risk of academic under-performance or failure in public universities.	3.16	0.71	3.12	0.76	HE
9	Predictive analytics tools provide personalized academic interventions or recommendations for students based on their learning patterns.	3.00	0.67	3.04	0.66	HE
10	Predictive analytics tools support academic advisors in tracking and supporting students' academic progress.	3.04	0.76	2.96	0.77	HE
11	Predictive analytics tools help predict students' success in specific courses or programmes, guiding academic	3.08	0.73	2.96	0.69	HE

S/N	Items	Students n = 382		Admin. Staff n = 159		Remark
		M	SD	M	SD	
	planning.					
12	Predictive analytics tools enhance the ability of university staff to proactively address students' academic needs before issues become critical.	3.03	0.71	3.08	0.77	HE
13	Predictive analytics tools improve the targeting of academic resources and support services to students who need them the most.	2.99	0.69	2.91	0.63	HE
14	Predictive analytics tools provide insights that enable universities to make data-driven decisions to enhance student learning outcomes.	3.16	0.64	3.03	0.67	HE
	Grand Mean	3.07		3.01		HE

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

The grand mean stood at 3.07 for students and 3.01 for administrative staff, as shown in Table 2. Both fall within the high extent range, which indicates that predictive analytics systems were seen as effective for identifying and supporting

at-risk students and for supplying the data-driven insight on which stronger support services depend.

Research Question 3: To what extent do AI-powered writing assistants enhance support services for students in public universities in Rivers State?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Difference between Administrative Staff and Students Perceptions of AI-powered Writing Assistants for Enhancing Student Support Services in Public Universities

S/N	Items	Students n = 382		Admin. Staff n = 159		Remark
		M	SD	M	SD	
15	AI-powered writing assistants help students improve the clarity and organization of their academic writing.	3.13	0.71	3.01	0.65	HE
16	AI-powered writing assistants support students in correcting grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors in academic work.	3.16	0.73	2.93	0.80	HE
17	AI-powered writing assistants assist students in understanding academic writing standards and referencing styles.	2.95	0.64	2.78	0.80	HE
18	AI-powered writing assistants reduce students' reliance on manual writing support from lecturers or support staff.	2.88	0.72	2.95	0.74	HE
19	AI-powered writing assistants enhance students' confidence in completing assignments, projects and research work.	2.89	0.65	2.91	0.59	HE
20	AI-powered writing assistants provide timely feedback that supports students' academic writing development.	2.98	0.71	2.94	0.68	HE
21	AI-powered writing assistants improve students' overall satisfaction with academic support services in the university.	3.08	0.77	2.88	0.74	HE
	Grand Mean	3.01		2.91		HE

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

Table 3 shows a mean of 3.01 for students and 2.91 for administrative staff. Each grand mean lies within the High Extent range, so both groups regarded AI-enabled writing assistant tools as valuable for improving writing quality, notwithstanding the small numerical gap between them.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which AI-powered mental health systems enhance emotional support services for students in public universities in Rivers State.

Table 4: z-test Analysis on the Difference between Staff and Students' Perceptions on the Extent to which AI-powered Mental Health Systems enhance Support Services in Public Universities in Rivers State

Respondents	N	M	SD	df	p	z-cal	z-crit	Decision
Students	382	3.04	0.48	539	0.135	1.49	±1.96	Failed to reject
Staff	159	2.99	0.35					Not Significant

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

Table 4 records students at $M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.48$ and administrative staff at $M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.35$, with $df = 539$. The calculated z value of 1.49 falls inside the z-critical range of ± 1.96 . No significant difference therefore existed between the two groups in their perceptions of how far AI-powered mental health support can strengthen support services. The null hypothesis was not rejected, showing that students and

staff hold comparable views on what AI-powered mental health systems offer emotional support services.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which predictive analytics tools enhance academic support services for students in public universities in Rivers State.

Table 5: z-test Analysis on the Difference between Staff and Students' Perceptions on the Extent to which Predictive Analytics Tools enhance Support Services in Public Universities in Rivers State

Respondents	N	M	SD	df	p	z-cal	z-crit	Decision
Students	382	3.07	0.46	539	0.251	1.15	±1.96	Failed to reject
Staff	159	3.01	0.49					Not Significant

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

As shown in Table 5, students returned $M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.46$ and administrative staff $M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.49$, with $df = 539$. The calculated z value of 1.15 lies within the z-critical range of ± 1.96 , so no significant difference was found between the perceptions of the two groups. The null hypothesis was not rejected, which shows that students and staff take similar

views of what predictive analytics can contribute to administrative support services.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of administrative staff and students on the extent to which AI-powered writing assistants enhance student support services in public universities in Rivers State.

Table 6: z-test Analysis on the Difference between Staff and Students' Perceptions on the Extent to which AI-powered Writing Assistants enhance Support Services in Public Universities in Rivers State

Respondents	N	M	SD	df	p	z-cal	z-crit	Decision
Students	382	3.01	0.49	539	0.015	2.41	±1.96	Reject
Staff	159	2.91	0.40					Significant

Source: Researcher's Excel Data Output (2026)

Table 6 gives students at $M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.49$ and administrative staff at $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.40$, with $df = 539$. Here the calculated z value of 2.41 falls outside the z-critical range of ± 1.96 . The null hypothesis was accordingly rejected, showing that students and staff differed in their views of what AI-powered writing assistant tools contribute to student support services.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Research question 1, presented in Table 1, produced student and staff means that both sat in the high extent range. Students and administrative staff thus perceived that AI-powered mental health systems could help students handle stress, anxiety and emotional distress while at the same time lifting the stigma that often attaches to seeking help from a human counsellor, so that the support environment becomes more approachable and less intimidating. The result is consistent with Khan et al. (2025), who reported that AI-powered mental health systems can deliver cost-effective, confidential and scalable emotional support to students and so reinforce institutional support structures. Sun et al. (2025) lent further

weight to this, having found that the use of AI-based mental health tools was positively associated with psychological well-being both directly and through the mediating effect of emotional self-efficacy and perceived autonomy, which underlines the value of such tools for student resilience. Hypothesis 1, shown in Table 4, returned a z-calculated value of 1.49, inside the z-critical value of ± 1.96 , so the null hypothesis was not rejected and the two groups stood in statistical agreement. The absence of a significant difference suggests that students and administrative staff alike recognise the relative advantage of tools that offer low-barrier, round-the-clock assistance and thereby strengthen psychological and emotional support services. Reyes-Portillo et al. (2025) reached a compatible position in arguing that AI-driven psychological tools supply essential immediate triage wherever human counsellors are stretched too thin, which speaks to their practical relevance. Bringing AI-powered mental health systems into public universities in Rivers State could therefore ease the difficulties that accompany wholly human-dependent service systems, while lifting student satisfaction and institutional responsiveness, making such

systems a workable and consequential part of modern student support services.

Research question 2, set out in Table 2, likewise produced student and staff means within the high extent range, so the perceptions of the two groups regarding predictive analytics systems ran along similar lines. Predictive analytics was seen as valuable for identifying at-risk students, tailoring academic interventions and supporting data-driven decisions aimed at better student outcomes. The finding agrees with Green et al. (2025), who established that predictive analytics systems significantly improve learning outcomes, particularly where they function as collaborative instruments supporting early intervention, strategic planning and reflective dialogue among educators. Utibe et al. (2025) offered corroboration in reporting that predictive models correctly identified 91.8% of students who passed and 82.9% of those who failed, which demonstrates both strong predictive capability and usefulness for decision-making. Hypothesis 2, in Table 5, returned a z-calculated value of 1.15, within the z-critical value of ± 1.96 , so the null hypothesis was not rejected and no significant difference emerged between the perceptions of students and administrative staff. Both groups therefore appear to recognise the relative advantage of predictive analytics for retention and support through timely, data-informed intervention. Nwuke and Yellowe (2025) reinforced this in the Rivers State context, having established that AI-assisted monitoring makes administrative oversight timelier and more consistent. Read together with the present result, this suggests that the value staff place on predictive analytics rests on its capacity to turn routine institutional data into early administrative action, rather than on the sophistication of the technology as such.

Research question 3, in Table 3, again returned student and staff means inside the high extent range, so both groups recognised AI-enabled writing assistant tools as an effective means of improving academic writing, though with some difference in the intensity of their views. The finding is in line with Alkamel and Alwagieh (2024), who observed that students hold positive perceptions of AI writing tools because of the gains they bring in writing fluency, grammatical accuracy and overall quality. Hypothesis 3, in Table 6, returned a z-calculated value of 2.41, which exceeds the z-critical value of ± 1.96 , so the null hypothesis was rejected and a significant difference established between the perceptions of students and staff. Although both groups rated the tools to a high extent, they did not share the same confidence about what those tools mean for academic practice: students judged their effectiveness more strongly than staff did, a divergence most probably shaped by differences in patterns of use and in role. Zhao et al. (2025) reported a similar pattern, finding that students, and especially those facing learning challenges, benefit substantially from AI writing tools while educators remain wary of ethical implications and misuse. Fitra et al. (2025) noted in the same vein that digital writing tools raise student self-efficacy even as faculty members continue to worry about where legitimate assistance ends and automated plagiarism begins. The implication is that universities should do more than integrate AI writing tools into student support

services; they should also mount structured AI literacy programmes that direct students towards ethical and effective use, and equip staff with strategies for redesigning assessment so that misuse is minimised. Taylor et al. (2025) throw further light on the divergence, having reported that academic staff in Rivers State-owned universities were only moderately aware of artificial intelligence tools, used them to a low extent and remained troubled by the ethical questions at stake. That finding offers a plausible account of the more cautious staff ratings recorded here, since thin direct experience of a tool tends to yield more guarded judgements about it. The reading also strengthens the case made by LongJohn and LongJohn (2026) for institutionalised professional learning, on the argument that a perception gap of this kind is more likely to close through structured capacity development than through exposure alone.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that AI-powered mental health systems, predictive analytics systems and AI-enabled writing assistant tools are perceived to enhance student support services to a high extent in public universities in Rivers State. The findings show that these technologies hold considerable potential for strengthening emotional support, improving the early identification of academically vulnerable students and enhancing academic writing support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. University management should build AI-powered mental health systems and predictive analytics systems into institutional counselling services, so as to improve students' emotional well-being, widen access to psychological support and enable the early identification of students at academic risk.
2. Government and university governing councils should raise their investment in digital infrastructure, including dependable internet access, data management systems and the AI platforms on which sustainable implementation within student support services depends.
3. University management should mount regular training programmes for staff and students alike to build AI literacy, so that users are able to apply AI tools effectively and responsibly for academic and administrative purposes.

REFERENCES

1. Alkamel, M. A., & Alwagieh, N. A. (2024). Utilizing an adaptable artificial intelligence writing tool (ChatGPT) to enhance academic writing skills among Yemeni university EFL students. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101095>
2. Almada, A. (2021). *A proactive chatbot framework designed to assist students based on the PS2CLH model*. [Doctoral thesis, London Metropolitan University]. London Met Repository. <https://repository.londonmet.ac.uk>

3. Chaushi, B. A., Ismaili, F., & Chaushi, A. (2024). Pros and cons of artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Advanced Natural Sciences and Engineering Researches*, 8(2), 51-57.
4. Elsayad, A. (2023, May 15). Student support and retention: What, why and how? *Higher Education Digest*.
<https://www.highereducationdigest.com/student-support-and-retention-what-why-and-how>
5. Eltahir, M. E., & Babiker, F. (2024). The influence of artificial intelligence tools on student performance in e-learning environments: Case study. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22(9), 91-110.
6. Fitra, R., Andrea, R., Radityo, T. N., & Kartini. (2025). Artificial intelligence tools in supporting students' academic writing tasks: Benefits and limitations. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Inggris*, 5(3), 218-230.
7. Giannini, S. (2024, May 29). Use of AI in education: Deciding on the future we want. *UNESCO*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/use-ai-education-deciding-future-we-want>
8. Green, D., Thompson, E., & Ocinne, I. (2025). Predictive analytics to enhance learning outcomes: Cases from UK schools. *Journal Emerging Technologies in Education*, 3(1), 34-43.
9. Khan, F., Kayser, N., & Madiba, M. (2025). Enhancing student well-being and success through AI-driven mental-health support: A case study of AI mental-health chatbot implementation at a South African University. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 13(2), 125-140.
<https://doi.org/10.24085/jsaa.v13i2.5983>
10. LongJohn, D. A., & LongJohn, N. (2026). Transformative professional development for Rivers State teachers' capacity building in a globally competitive learning environment. *BW Academic Journal*.
<https://bwjournal.org/index.php/bsjournal/article/view/4092>
11. Mohammed, M. N., & Wey-Amaewhule, B. (2026). Leveraging artificial intelligence tools for student support services in open and distance learning study centres in Rivers State. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation*, 12(1), 382-394.
12. Mohammed-Shittu, N. (2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI)-driven decision support systems for sustainable administration of public universities in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University*, 1(1), 651-663.
13. Muhammad, A., & Wayhu, R. S. (2024). Mental health of Z-Generation analysis of learning process and social interaction. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 20(2), 221-230.
14. Nwuke, T. J., & Yellowe, A. N. (2025). Utilization of artificial intelligence in school supervision for effective administration in public secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University*, 1(1), 318-334.
15. Reyes-Portillo, J. A., So, A., McAlister, K., Nicodemus, C., Golden, A., Jacobson, C., & Huberty, J. (2025). Generative AI-powered mental wellness chatbot for college student mental wellness: Open trial. *JMIR Formative Research*, 9.
16. Shaheen, S., Mahmood, Z., & Shah, N. H. (2020). Impact of student support services on students' development at university level. *Global Regional Review*, V(1), 222-229.
[https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020\(V-I\).25](https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).25)
17. Sun, X., Jahangir, A., Algamdi, A. A., & Liu, F. (2025). Use of AI-based mental health tools and psychological well-being among Chinese university students: A parallel mediation model of emotional self-efficacy and perceived autonomy. *Scientific Reports*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-24013-8>
18. Taylor, D. I., Jack, B. D., & Wami, K. C. (2025). Assessment of awareness and adoption of artificial intelligence tools for enhanced job performance of adult educators in Rivers State-owned universities. *International Journal of Educational Management, Rivers State University*, 1(1), 113-127.
19. Tuomi, I. (2018). The impact of artificial intelligence on learning, teaching and education. In M. Cabrera, R. Vuorikari, & Y. Punie (Eds.), *Policies for the future*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
20. Utibe, V. E., Shamsudeen, M. S., & Adesegun, N. O. (2025). Predictive analytics using machine learning models on undergraduate students' performance of the Federal University of Allied Health Sciences, Enugu, Nigeria in introduction to computing science. *Saudi Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 10(7), 324-332.
<https://doi.org/10.36348/sjet.2025.v10i07.004>
21. Wey-Amaewhule, B., Osuji, C. U., & Clet-Anucha, U. C. (2024). Administrative strategies and actualization of organizational goals in Rivers and Bayelsa States owned universities. *International Journal of Innovative Psychology & Social Development*, 12(4), 130-144.
22. Zhao, X., Sbaffi, L., & Cox, A. (2025). The digitization of writing in higher education: Exploring the use of Wordtune as an AI writing assistant. *Electronics*, 14, 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics14061194>